# IN THE COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

ANTHONY GRAY, AIS # 196022,	)
Plaintiff,	)
vs.	) CIVIL ACTION NO ) 2:06-CV-749-ID
INEZ ALEXANDER, et. al.,	<b>\</b>
Defendants.	)

### SPECIAL REPORT

Come now the Alabama Department of Corrections (hereinafter referred to as ADOC) Defendants, Inez Alexander and Carol Longmire, by and through the undersigned counsel in the above styled action, and file this Special Report as follows:

### PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff alleges that his constitutional rights under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments was violated by Defendants, specifically that the Defendants denied him his due process rights concerning a disciplinary he received for Indecent Exposure/Exhibitionism.

#### **DEFENSES**

The Defendants deny that they have violated the constitutional rights of the Plaintiff and demand the strict

proof thereof.

The Defendants allege that the Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

The Defendants allege that the Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which a 42 U.S.C.§ 1983 action can be maintained.

The Defendants allege that at least part of the Plaintiff's claim is based upon the theory of respondent superior and cannot be maintained under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The Defendants plead the general defense.

The Defendants allege that they are entitled to qualified immunity against the claims of the Plaintiff.

The Defendants allege that they are entitled to absolute immunity against the claims of the Plaintiff.

The Defendants allege that the Plaintiff suffered no loss of a liberty interest in the complained of disciplinary.

The Defendants reserve the right to amend their defenses, including the addition of affirmative defenses, upon the receipt of information through discovery and otherwise.

### STATEMENT OF FACTS

Plaintiff is an inmate presently incarcerated at the Ventress Correctional Facility. He has brought this action after receiving a disciplinary hearing for Indecent

Exposure/Exhibitionism. On April 17, 2006, at the Ventress Correctional Facility, the Plaintiff was observed by CO I Alexander masturbating while looking at her. She ordered Inmate Gray to the dorm's lobby area and verbally reprimanded him on his negative behavior. Later Officer Alexander wrote disciplinary Inmate Gray for Indecent a Exposure/Exhibitionism. Inmate Gray was served with the disciplinary on April 18, 2006. No witnesses were requested. On April 25, 2006, Inmate Gray received his disciplinary hearing. The Hearing Officer found Inmate Gray quilty and recommended a sanction of forty-five (45) days in disciplinary segregation, loss of thirty (30) days of privileges and loss Hearing Officer's o£ thirty days of good time. The recommendation was approved by the Warden.

#### ARGUMENT

Code of Alabama § 14-1-8 (6) 1975, states as one of the functions of the Department of Corrections is to

"promulgate such rules and regulations necessary to hygiene, sanitation, cleanliness, healthfulness, feeding of prisoners, management and security of all prisons and jails."

As such, the Department of Corrections has published rules and regulations. The publication of rules is sufficient for the purpose of due process to put the plaintiff on notice as to

the rules he was required to obey. <u>See e.g.</u>, <u>United States v.</u>

<u>Vasarajs</u>, 908 F.2d. 443 (9th Cir. 1990) (Generally disgusting in a criminal context satisfaction of due process notice requirements through publication).

The courts, have repeatedly recognized that the operation of a penal institution is, at best, a difficult assignment and that penal authorities must be given broad ranging discretion and latitude in which to carry out their duties. See Hewitt v. Helms, 459 U.S. 460,103 S.Ct. 864,74 L.Ed.2d 675(1983). "Prison administrators . . . should be accorded wide-ranging deference in the adoption and execution of policies and practices that in their Judgment are needed to preserve internal order and discipline and to maintain institutional security." Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520,547, 99 S.Ct. 1861, 1877, 60 L.Ed.2d 447 (1979); Sims v. Mashburn, 25 F.3d 980 (11th Cir. 1994).

Defendants allege that some of the sanctions imposed upon the Plaintiff in this disciplinary do not amount to a loss of a liberty interest. In <u>Sandin v. Conner</u>, 115 U.S. 2298 (1995), Conner alleged that Hawaii prison officials deprived him of procedural due process when a committee refused to allow him to present witnesses during a disciplinary hearing and then sentenced him to segregation for misconduct. The

Supreme Court held that discipline in segregated confinement did not present the type of a typical, significant deprivation which would create a liberty interest and entitle the prisoner to protection under Wolff v. McDonnell.

[As such, disciplinary segregation is not a 'dramatic departure' from the ordinary conditions of confinement nor is it a 'major disruption in [prisoners'] environment.' Thus, under the authority of Sandin v. Conner, prisoners sentenced to loss of privileges have no protected interest requiring the due-process protection outlined in Wolff v. McDonnell." See Earl Howard v. Deborah Wormely, et al., Mag. Op. CV-94-PT-2280-M(N.D. Ala. June 22, 1995), p. 4.

As to Inmate Gray loss of good time, the Defendants argue that Inmate Gray received all of the due process rights as enunciated in Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 41 L.Ed.2d 935, 94 S.Ct.2963 (1974). The Defendants argue that the disciplinary hearing provided for Plaintiff was sufficient and did comport with the standards spelled out in Wolff. In Wolff, the United States Supreme Court set forth the due process mandates in a prison disciplinary proceeding as (1) the inmate must be given advance written notice of the charges, (2) an opportunity to call witnesses and present documentary evidence provided it will not be unduly hazardous to institutional safety or correctional goals and (3) the fact-finders must issue a written statement stating the evidence relied upon and the reasons for any disciplinary action. The Plaintiff was provided all of those Fourteenth Amendment due

process rights. The Plaintiff's complaint does not state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Additionally, there was "some evidence" as required by <u>Superintendent v. Hill</u>, 472 U.S. 445 (1985).

As there are no issues of material fact and for the reasons herein stated, the ADOC Defendants pursuant to F.R.C.P. 56(b), request that a motion for summary judgment be granted in their favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim T. Thomas General Counsel Assistant Attorney General

<u>/S/Albert S. Butler</u>
Albert S. Butler
Assistant General Counsel
Assistant Attorney General

### ADDRESS OF COUNSEL:

Alabama Department of Corrections 301 South Ripley Street P. O. Box 301501 Montgomery, Alabama 36130-1501 (334) 353-3885

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing documents upon:

Inmate Anthony Gray, AIS #196022 Ventress Correctional Facility P. O. Box 767 Clayton, Alabama 36016

by placing a copy of said documents in the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid on October 3, 2006.

/s/Albert S. Butler
Albert S. Butler
Assistant General Counsel
Assistant Attorney General

# FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

Anthony Gray, Jr., #196022	)
Plaintiff,	
vs.	) Civil Action No. 2:06CV749-ID
COI Inez Alexander, Sgt. Carolyn Longmire	) }
Defendants.	)

### <u>AFFIDAVIT</u>

Before me, the undersigned Notary Public, did personally appear Inez Alexander, who being duly sworn, deposes and presents the following affidavit.

My name is Inez Alexander and I am an individual over the age of twenty-one years. I am employed with the State of Alabama, Department of Corrections at Ventress Correctional Facility, Clayton, Alabama. I am employed in this capacity as a Correctional Officer I. I have read the complaint in the above styled cause and note that inmate Gray alleges that on April 17, 2006 at approximately 11:39 a.m. and 11:44 a.m., he was stopped by Officer Alexander and asked what he was doing at the urinal that morning. He alleges that he replied, "what are you talking about?" He further claims that COI Alexander responded "Don't worry, I'm going to check your jacket, you can leave."

Page 2 Affidavit -- Inez Alexander

The circumstances are as follows: on April 17, 2006, Inmate Anthony Gray was seen by me, Officer Alexander standing in 7 dorm on B side in front of the urinal stroking his exposed and erect penis while watching me in 7 dorm cubicle. I, Inez Alexander, COI did initiate disciplinary action for Rule Violation #38, specifically, "Indecent Exposure/Exhibitionism." This is the extent of my involvement in this incident.

The before mentioned facts are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Inez Alexander

State of Alabama )

Barbour County

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 19 day

\_day of September, 2006.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

# FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

Anthony Gray, Jr., #196022	)
Plaintiff,	)
vs.	Civil Action No. 2:06CV749-ID
COI Inez Alexander, Sgt. Carolyn Longmire	) }
Defendants.	)

### <u>AFFIDAVIT</u>

Before me, the undersigned Notary Public, did personally appear Carolyn Longmire, who being duly sworn, deposes and presents the following affidavit.

My name is Carolyn Longmire and I am an individual over the age of twenty-one years. I am employed with the State of Alabama, Department of Corrections at Ventress Correctional Facility, Clayton, Alabama. I am employed in this capacity as a Correctional Officer II. I have read the complaint in the above styled cause and note that inmate Gray alleges that due to the fact that I am a female Sergeant and was the hearing officer who found him guilty for Rule Violation #38, "Indecent Exposure/Exhibitionism" at his hearing on April 25, 2006, that his due process rights and Amendment 8 were violated.

Page 2 Affidavit – Carolyn Longmire

On April 25, 2006, I was the Hearing Officer for a disciplinary on Inmate Anthony Gray, B/196022. Inmate Gray was charged for violation Rule Violation #38, "Indecent Exposure/Exhibitionism." Inmate Gray was found guilty based on the arresting officer's testimony which I accepted and believed. I have no knowledge of any other dealings with inmate Gray.

The before mentioned facts are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

avolemborgnure 9-19ignature Date

State of Alabama )

Barbour County

Sworn to and subscribed before me this \_\_\_\_\_day of September, 2006.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

### AFFIDAVIT

)

### STATE OF ALABAMA

I, Reba T. Currie, hereby certify and affirm that I am an ASAIII, at Ventress Correctional Facility; that I am one of the custodian of records at this institution; that the attached documents are true, exact, and correct photocopies of certain documents maintained here in the institutional files; and that I am over the age of twenty-one years and am competent to testify to the aforesaid documents and matters stated therein.

I further certify and affirm that said documents on Anthony Gray, #196022 are maintained in the usual and ordinary course of business at the Ventress Correctional Facility; and that said documents were made at, or reasonably near the time that the transactions referred to therein are said to have occurred.

This, I do hereby certify and affirm to on this the 21 day of 1006

Signature

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME THIS 2106.

DAY OF

7

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:\_

0106/00/10

### STATE OF ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

### **INCIDENT REPORT**

1. Institution: VENTRESS CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	2. Date: April 17, 2006	3. Time: 9:40 AM	4. Incident Number: Class Code: IN 06-496
5. Location Where Incident Occurred:			ndecent Exposure/Exhibitionism;
Dorm 7 Bathroom 7. Time Incident Reported:		8. Who Received Report:	
9:45 AM	*	Sgt. Dorothy Flo	wers Doubly flowers, Eou
9. Victims: Name		AIS	7
a. N/A		N/A	
b	No.		
10. Suspects: Name AIS		/itnesses; Name	AIS
•			
		N/A	The state of the s
	c.		
e. No.			
210.			
13. Description of Evidence:  N/A  14. Chain of Evidence:  a N/A b c			
15. Narrative Summary: On April 17, 2006, at Cubicle Officer. Officer Alexander obseexposed erect penis in an upward and Officer Alexander gave inmate Gray a Alexander verbally reprimanded inmate Officer Alexander reported the incide disciplinary action for Rule Violation #3 further action taken at this time.	erved inmate Anthony downward motion, w direct order to report Gray concerning inma ent to Sgt. Dorothy 1	Gray, B/196022, star hile looking directly to 7 dorm's lobby a te Gray's negative be Flowers. Inmate G Exhibitionism from A	nding at the urinal on 7B stroking his at Officer Alexander in Cubicle 7. rea. Inmate Gray complied. Officer chavior. At approximately 9:45 a.m., ray remains in population pending



Page 3 of 6

C Form 2	225B Re	vised 7/92)					
INN		06-145 Anthony G	ray	_ CUSTODY:	ME	AIS NO.: <b>B/196022</b>	
The spec	above n	amed inmate  Indecent Ex	is being charg posure/Exhil	oitionism from r	ez Alexande egulation # 4	er with a violation of rule #3 403, which occurred on or ab	out
		<b>006 at (time)</b> after 24 hours			B Urinal Arc	ea. A hearing on this charge	
obs	erved b	y Officer Ale	exander stan		nal stroking	nthony Gray, B/196022 w your exposed and erect pe	
			Officer Alex		0	· M. L. 1. 07	
Date	ril 17, 20 e	006		Arresting Office	r / Signature /	Kank Col	
info que	ormed in	mate of his rig	to present	rved a copy of the a written or oral /8 day of _4	statement at	pon the above named inmate a the hearing and to present wr. 2006, at (time) 7.55	itten
Ser	elicia ving Offi	P.Willicer / Signature	and Co	in fin	nate's Signatu	6729 196022 ure / A/IS Number 12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
	tnesses de		Apmate's Sig	Cary mature	YES	Inmate's Signature	0
Ify	es, list:		7 0		COR COLUMN TO SERVICE A SE		
Hea	aring Dat	e 4-25	-06	Time	AM.	Place DOFM#1 1	e [
		Charles and the second of the second of the second	V Marrie and a	capable of represe	aroly	ctail on additional page and atta  fingmere Coll g officer	ch:
. Ple	a: ##	6	By E	Not Guilty	U	Guilty	
The	e Appest	ng Officer, Inm	ate, and all wi	nesses were sworp	to tell the tru	longrade ) COIT	
. Ar	resting O	fficer's testimo	ny (at the hea		/ Hearing Office as #4.	cer ()	
						121	

5-3-06 U

H A	Anthony Gray
	220961
() why alid you ask me what	4
- the Warner AVE hour = A	O I was & soy
30 to 40 privites Coming Inc.	n Chow. I know what he was
doing	
3 4 = was mostur boting in	- the criate why
you didn't colled me to	
	or AOK JOR ID I didn't
need to radio for assistant, I	know what he was doing.
3 How cake you tell 7 =	was Stroker my
punis or stalling the	Crise of my
penis It didn't take	him that long to shake
urine from his penis,	<u> </u>
The Displacing states the	+ I was Stroking
My penis, why die	you wait butter from
I come from Chow	AND ASK ME What
	what he is talking about when he
Came from Chow.	~ 1 0 =
5 Towhom It may cond	ery I hav surgery
Enection. I had th	THIS I AND SIDE
Irrevelant,	is songoing in prison.
	and the state of t

Case 2:06-cv-00749-ID-SRW Document 7-4, Filed 10/03/2006 Page 6 of 6 N266 STATE OF ALABAMA Department of Corrections Inmate Stationery